



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,428	04/19/2001	Janani Janakiraman	AUS920010015US1	3585

35525 7590 01/11/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/838,428	Applicant(s) JANAKIRAMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Laurie Ries	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 10/12/2004, to the original application, filed 4/19/2001.
2. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Rogers (U.S. Patent 5,915,256) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
5. Claims 2, 9, and 16 have been cancelled.
6. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon (U.S. Publication 2004/0078188 A1) in view of Cramer (U.S. Publication 2002/0104096 A1).

As per claims 1, 8, and 15, Gibbon discloses a method, system, and computer program product for presenting text from multimedia data to a user including receiving multimedia data containing an associated number of blocks of text data where the

number of blocks of text data includes a first text data block associated with a first number of video frames of the multimedia data, and a second text data block associated with a second number of video frames of the multimedia data (See Gibbon, Page 2, paragraph 0030, and Figure 1); extracting the associated number of sets of text data from the multimedia data (See Gibbon, Figure 5, element 5030, Page 3, paragraph 0036, and Claim 1), and outputting the first text data with a one video frame of the first number of video frames (See Gibbon, Page 8, paragraph 0119). Gibbon does not disclose expressly, responsive to determining that the text in the multimedia data has changed from the first text data set to the second text data set, outputting the second text data set and a one video frame of the second number of video frames. Cramer discloses outputting video and text data such that the non-video content and the video content are synchronized (See Cramer, Claim 15). Gibbon and Cramer are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of producing multimedia presentations. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the video and non-video synchronization of Cramer with the system and method for presenting text from multimedia data of Gibbon. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the video or other streamed content to control the display of text and other non-streamed content within other screens in synchronization with the playing of the streamed content (See Cramer, Page 1, paragraph 0005). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cramer with Gibbon for the benefit of enabling the video to control the display video to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 8, and 15.

As per claims 3, 10, and 17, Gibbon and Cramer disclose the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 as described above. Gibbon also discloses that more than one of the number of sets of text data are presented to the user simultaneously (See Gibbon, Page 2, paragraph 0030).

As per claims 4, 11, and 18, Gibbon and Cramer disclose the limitations of claims 3, 10, and 17 as described above. Gibbon also discloses that the more than one of the number of sets of text data are presented in separate frames (See Gibbon, figure 16, and Page 8, paragraph 0123).

As per claims 5, 12, and 19, Gibbon and Cramer disclose the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 as described above. Gibbon also discloses that the first text data set and the second text data set are presented to the user individually in a sequential order (See Gibbon, Page 2, paragraph 0030, and Page 7, paragraph 0116-0117).

As per claims 6, 13, and 20, Gibbon and Cramer disclose the limitations of claims 5, 12, and 19 as described above. Gibbon also discloses that a next set of data in the sequential order is presented in response to an indication by the user to display the next set of text data (See Gibbon, Page 7, paragraph 0117).

As per claims 7, 14, and 21, Gibbon and Cramer disclose the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 as described above. Gibbon also discloses that the step of extracting the number of sets of text data includes parsing the multimedia data to determine the first text data set and the one video frame of the first number of video frames and discarding any moving image data (See Gibbon, Figure 5, element 5040, and Page 3, paragraph 0037).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Dey (U.S. Patent 6,569,206 B1) discloses the facilitation of hypervideo by automatic IR techniques in response to user requests.
- Rogers (U.S. Patent 5,915,256) discloses a multimedia method and apparatus for presenting a story using a bimodal spine.
- Yuen (U.S. Publication 2002/0054073 A1) discloses an electronic book with indexed text-to-audio switching capabilities.
- Griencewic (U.S. Patent 6,320,591 B1) discloses a system and method for the utilization of an electronic book.
- Rivette (U.S. Patent 5,991,780) discloses a system and method for selectively displaying patent text and images.
- Mackay discloses virtual video editing in interactive multimedia applications.
- Balkir discloses delivering presentations from multimedia servers.

- Casey discloses models of Web-based education.
- Naps discloses using the WWW as the delivery mechanism for interactive, visualization-based instructional modules.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM EST.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Field, can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

LR
1/6/2005


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISOR
EXAMINER